

**REMARKS**

Initially, in the Office Action dated June 5, 2003, the Examiner rejects claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, 16-18, 20-22, and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,341,350 (Miyahara et al.). The Examiner objects to claims 3, 7, 11, 15, 19 and 23 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but indicates that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 17, 18, 21, 22, 25 and 26 have been amended. Claims 1-26 remain pending in this application.

**Allowable subject matter**

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 3, 7, 11, 15, 19 and 23 contain allowable subject matter.

**35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections**

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, 16-18, 20-22 and 24-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Miyahara et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Miyahara et al. discloses image data processing by which accompanying information is embedded as a watermark into coded image data, a position in a block as a unit of coding the coded image data is detected, a blocked watermark pattern is provided, an area in which an operation relative to a first level value is performed and an area in which an operation relative to a second level value is performed are offered, and a watermark is appended to the coded image data in accordance with the blocked watermark pattern.

Regarding claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 17, 18, 21, 22, 25 and 26, Applicants submit that Miyahara et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, inter alia, allocating each of areas S constituting each area G to some one of: areas  $T_1 - T_n$  which said digital watermark information  $b_1 - b_n$ , a bit value of the digital watermark information being 0 or 1, is respectively embedded and areas  $H_1 - H_m$  ( $1 = m$ ) in which any of bit information 0 and 1 is not embedded, or extracting digital watermark information  $b_1 - b_n$  ( $2 = n$ ), a bit value of the digital watermark information being 0 or 1, from image data in which the digital watermark information is embedded that includes detecting areas  $H_1 - H_m$  ( $1 = m$ ) in which information is not embedded from the plurality of areas S or recognizing a plurality of areas G each consisting of  $P \times Q$  ( $1 = P, Q$ ) of the areas S, the plurality of areas G being located on the image data, and the recognition being carried out based on locations of the detecting areas  $H_1 - H_m$  ( $1 = m$ ) on the image data. Miyahara et al. discloses that when a bit value is 1, a watermark is embedded as to n number of each area. When a bit value is 0, no watermark is embedded in the areas. In contrast, the claims of the present application disclose that when a block is T, a watermark having a bit value of 1 or 0 is embedded in each area S. When a block is H, no watermark is embedded in the areas. Further, Miyahara et al. discloses a correlation value between watermark pattern and original image data is obtained as to n number of each area, and the bit value is detected as 1 or 0 according to whether the watermark is detected or not. If there is a gap in the matching between the original data and the watermark, the watermark cannot be detected. In contrast, the claims of the present application disclose a correlation

value between watermark pattern and original image data is obtained so as to detect a part with no watermark embedded (H block), and with reference to the H block, a gap in the matching between the original image data and the watermark pattern is detected and a location of block T is identified. Accordingly, according to the present invention, it is possible to detect watermark even when there is the gap in the matching.

Regarding claims 4, 8, 12, 16, 20 and 24, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on one of the independent claims noted previously, and are patentable over the cited references at least for the same reasons note regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Miyahara et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, 16-18, 20-22 and 24-26 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-26 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested.

U.S. Application No. 09/583,952

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (referencing attorney docket no. 566.38616X00).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



---

Frederick D. Bailey  
Registration No. 42,282

FDB/sdb  
(703) 312-6600